

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:	10/541,147	Confirmation No.:	6158
Applicant:	Paolo Steinbach		
Filing Date:	10/03/2005		
Art Unit:	4145		
Examiner:	Michael B. Nelson		
Docket No.:	KAR015		
Customer No.:	39232		

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated 03/10/2008, a **Response to the Restriction and Election Requirement** begins on page 2 of this paper.

RESPONSE TO THE RESTRICTION AND ELECTION REQUIREMENT

In the Restriction Requirement

A restriction has been requested among the following groups of claims:

Group I, readable on claims 1-35, 66-67, and 70-72

Group II, readable on claims 36-65, 68-69, and 73-77

Group III, readable on claims 78-83.

Applicant elects for prosecution Group I, readable on claims 1-35, 66-67, and 70-72. The election of Group I is made without traverse.

In the Election Requirement

An election has been requested among the following species:

- a. Claim 7
- b. Claim 8, with claims 1 and 6 being generic for species (a) and (b)
- c. Claim 70
- d. Claim 71
- e. Claim 72, with claim 1 being generic for species (c), (d), and (e)
- f. Claim 73
- g. Claim 74
- h. Claim 75, with claim 36 being generic for species (f), (g), and (h).

Species (a)-(e) are directed to elected Group I, and Applicant elects for prosecution species (a) from the group of species (a)-(b), and (c) from the group of species (c)-(e). Species (a) and (c) are believed to be readable on claims 1-7, 9-35, 66-67, and 70. No election is made from the group of species (f), (g), and (h) because these species are directed to non-elected Group II.

The present request for election is traversed at least for the following reasons.

MPEP 808.02 states that a request for election of species is proper only when each species requires a separate field of search or has attained a separate status in the art. It is submitted that none of these conditions is present in the instant case.

With regard to the election requirement between claims 7 and 8, the difference between of those two claims relates to how ripid (steep) the gradient function is. It is believed that searching for a gradient function that is more or less steep falls within the same field of search and has attained the same status in the art. With regard to the election requirement among claims 70-72, those claims relate to applications of panels that are manufactured using comparable technologies, so that no new filed of search is believed to be required.

For at least the above reasons, the withdrawal of the election requirement among species (a)-(e) is respectfully requested.

Dated: June 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Franco A. Serafini/

Franco A. Serafini, Registration No. 52,207

Attorney for Applicant

Tel.: (858) 456-2898

Fax: (858) 225-3920

THEMIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COUNSEL
7660 Fay Avenue, Suite H378
La Jolla, CA 92037